UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Let's Be Fair—and Wise!

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

Albert Schweitzer

By LEO RICH LEWIS

The Value of the Voice of the People

By FRANK S. HARWOOD

Women and War

By LILLIAN A. GARING

VOLUME CX NUMBER 17

Chicago, January 9, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

Unity Publishing Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*
Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
Mrs. S. O. Levinson, President
Mrs. E. L. Lobdell, Vice-President
Mrs. Francis Neilson, Treasurer
Mrs. Ella R. Nagely
Mrs. O. T. Knight
Mr. Irwin S. Rosenfels
Mr. C. W. Reese
Miss Matilda C. Schaff
Mrs. E. E. Smith
Mrs. Irwin S. Rosenfels
Mr. Francis Neilson
Secretary: May Johnson

Editorial Board
W. Waldemar W. Argow
Raymond B. Bragg
Edmund B. Chaffee
Zona Gale
A. Eustace Haydon
Jesse H. Holmes
Joseph Ernest McAfee
H. R. Mussey
Alson H. Robinson
Clarence R. Skinner
Sydney Strong
Arthur L. Weatherly

Poetry Editors
Lucia Trent
Ralph Cheyney

Editorial Contributors
Dorothy Walton Binder
Percy M. Dawson
James A. Fairley
M. C. Otto
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives
Australia—Charles Strong
Austria—Stefan Zweig
Bulgaria—P. M. Matthéeff
England—Harrison Brown
Fred Hankinson
Reginald Reynolds
Canada—Norman Stewart Dowd
France—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
Germany—Theodor Hahn
India—Rabindranath Tagore
Japan—Nobuichiro Imaoka
Palestine—Hans Kohn
Russia—Alina Huebsch

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 259
Let's Be Fair—and Wise!—Joseph Ernest McAfee 261
Jottings—J. H. H. 263

ARTICLES—
Albert Schweitzer—Leo Rich Lewis 264
The Value of the Voice of the People—Frank S. Harwood 265
Women and War—Lillian A. Garing 266
The Acme of Sensitiveness—(Rev.) Eliot White 267

POETRY—
The New Faith—(Rev.) Harold P. Marley 259
My Neighbor—Brent Allinson 263
Mona Lisa in the Slums—Eva Warner 267
Wouldst Thou Have Peace—Victor E. Southworth 267

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Gentle Art of Misinformation—Arthur L. Weatherly 268
The Crisis in Modern Jewry—Jennie Franklin Purvin 269

CORRESPONDENCE—
Joseph Smith and the Mormons—H. P. Boynton 270
The Doctors Against War—Lydia G. Wentworth 271
From a Firm Friend—Doremus Scudder 271
Equal Privileges for All—Etta Josephean Murfey 271
World Disarmament Depends on India—J. T. Sunderland 271
Encouragement—Isaac F. Baker 271
In the Same Boat—L. N. S. 271

THE FIELD—
Gandhi and the Indian Capitalists—*Amy Moore* 258

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi and the Indian Capitalists

By Miss Amy Moore

An impression that the National Congress is not representative of the Indian people has been deliberately aroused. In fact many people look upon its leaders as the willing tools of the Indian exploiters to whom freedom from Britain means freedom to exploit the Indian workers still more. The pages of the Rothermere and Beaverbrook Press express tenderness for the Indian masses whom they want to save from the hands of the Indian exploiters, a sympathy which is strangely lacking when the Indian peasants and workers are brutally treated and even massacred by the servants of English exploiters.

But this view of the Congress has not only been put forward by the whole of the British Capitalist Press. It has been propagated with even greater energy by working class and socialist organizations and publications in this country. To many members of the Labor Party it is an excuse to justify the attitude of the Labor Government to India. And members of the Third International honestly believe that Gandhi and the other Congress leaders are "agents of the Indian bourgeoisie." There is practically a united front from right to left against Gandhi and the Congress.

The fact that many wealthy Indian mill owners support the Congress financially and that the Congress policy is supported by many commercial associations and other capitalist organizations in India seems to lend color to this view. But does it prove that Gandhi and the Congress are the tools of the Indian capitalists? Although our experience of English politics may lead us to think that those who pay their money to any movement are going to control it and use it for their own ends, we must look a little closer into the facts before we assume that this is the case for India.

In the first place are we safe in assuming that all wealthy people who give money to the Congress are moved only by economic motives? If any of us had been an Indian in Amritsar who had been compelled to crawl on his belly every time he went out because of an act of violence upon an Englishwoman, with which act he had had nothing to do; or whose student son had been killed in a lathi charge when police invaded his University; or had himself been attacked and injured because he happened to be passing when there was a disturbance, we would realize that human beings are moved by other than economic motives. There are reasons other than economic ones why Indian capitalists should want to shake off the British yoke which means suffering and humiliation to them and their fellows.

In any case it seems very doubtful whether the Indian bourgeoisie would actually profit financially by India gaining her freedom. They would, of

(*Continued on page 271*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1933 Number 17

The New Faith

[A Humanistic Hymn]

O faith sublime, I've found at last
A rock on which to stand.
No longer flee I to the past,
But take my brother's hand.

No creed, no saint can quicken me
Like fire in mortal's eye,
Who struggles onward to be free,
Nor cares, nor fears to die.

O love that will not let us go,
Not found in ancient rite,
But burning ever here below:
Man's altruistic light.

It matters not how mean the way,
How slow our footsteps trail;
We come at last to newer day,
When only fear shall fail.

O faith, O love in human kind:
O vision fair to see:
Our every effort seeks to find
The high reality.

(Rev.) Harold P. Marley.

Developments at Geneva would seem to indicate the final humiliation of the League of Nations in the Manchurian affair. It is something, we suppose, that the case was heard and considered at all in this council of the nations. Let the hard-beset champions of the League get such comfort from this fact as they can! But the final outcome seems to us to be utterly disastrous. Japan's defiance at Geneva was absolute. There was a certain sublimity in its sheer arrogance. China's presentation of her grievances was so effective as to make even the Lytton Report seem a feeble thing. And in the face of this challenge, decisive to every principle for which the League of Nations is supposed to stand, the Assembly, like the Council before it, frankly and unashamedly capitulated. The reference of the issue to the Committee of Nineteen seems to us to be simply a subterfuge too disgraceful to be noted. How the League can survive this collapse, why any nation should ever put any trust in it again, we cannot see. Unless there comes some sudden change, the League is fated to go through certain mechanical motions, like a worn-out clock, until at last it runs down and stops. Nor is this the only disaster in the Geneva fiasco. Washington sees in it the annihilation of the Hoover-Stimson policy of non-recognition of territories seized and treaties written in violation of solemn international compacts. Also, there are pessimists who find in it the death of the Kellogg Pact. It is difficult to refute these assertions. Hope seems vain in such a dark hour as this. Personally, we propose to hope on until, perchance, as in Shelly's triumphant vision,

> " . . . Hope creates from its own wreck, the thing it contemplates."

But meanwhile, also, we propose to face facts.

Among the facts, referred to just above, is the fact that the situation in the Far East is going from bad to worse. The New York *Herald-Tribune* speaks of the "dark-red horizon" in Asia. Certainly there is a dreadful glow in that direction—as from the crater of a volcano aflame for violent eruption. For the resumption of diplomatic relations between nationalist China and Soviet Russia is of course a direct thrust at Japan, and the storms in Tokyo indicate how terribly the blow has struck home. In itself, and under ordinary circumstances, the resumption of severed relations between any two countries should be an occasion for rejoicing. But conditions in Asia—in Manchuria, Mongolia, and Siberia—are extraordinary. Japan and Russia are like two vast bodies moving swiftly to the occupancy of the same place—namely, China. How collision can be avoided is hard to say. But we cannot see why Japan should be angry at the turn of events, much less surprised. For it wasn't so long ago that China broke off contact with Russia, and sent the Bolshevik officials, agents, and propagandists packing bag and baggage back to Moscow. Here was Japan's chance? How has she used it? To visit upon the sorely distracted and distressed Chinese people such humiliation, such wanton attack and outrage, in violation of all pledges, as marks something like a new record for national dishonor. Betrayed by her neighbor, abandoned by the League of Nations, what can China do but find relief and support where it can be found? So we have this new alignment, which is of enormous portent not merely to Japan but to the West. For what will happen if China goes Communist? And how long will it be possible to maintain peace? Europe, it seems to us, was a trifling menace in 1914 as compared with Asia in 1915.

We have always repudiated, and still repudiate, the principle that "the end justifies the means." But we have never come so near to accepting this principle as in the case of the Philippine Independence Bill, recently passed by both houses of Congress. The motives behind this legislation are abominable—the desire to get rid of the Islands in order to rid the country of the competition of her products, especially sugar, in domestic markets. The methods used to carry the bill were loathsome—political log-rolling of the worst description. The mere appearance of Senator Huey Long as one of the outstanding champions of independence is nauseating. Nevertheless, there remains this mighty fact—that Congress has taken the first steps necessary for the freeing of the Philippines! Of course, we were solemnly pledged as a nation to this great act of liberation. But there are no morals in national promises. This pledge would never have been redeemed had political and economic conditions been favorable to the United States. But happily they were unfavorable! The Philippines, as an integral part of the republic, offered disastrous competition to home products. And so, for this utterly selfish reason, the Islands were not so much liberated as cast off. In this case circumstances, however unworthily motivated, were working to the accomplishment of a great and noble purpose. For whatever reason, *the Filipinos are now destined to be free!* Congressional difficulties may delay emancipation—President Hoover may block it. But destiny has spoken, and in a comparatively short period of time, the Philippine Islands will constitute an independent political sovereignty. How we wish that some similar, even if unworthy, complication in India would bring emancipation to that country! But, alas, conditions there work just the other way.

Professor Paul H. Douglas, outstanding authority in the field of labor statistics, offers in the *World Tomorrow* (December 20th) a revelation of present conditions which would be incredible if he did not produce the figures to support his statement. This statement has to do with wages as compared with interest and dividend payments in this past year, 1932. Taking the wages paid out to workers in 1926 as a standard 100 per cent, Professor Douglas shows, on the authority of the U. S. Burean of Labor Statistics, that the wage scale has rated in succeeding years as follows:

1927	97
1928	95
1929	100
1930	80
1931	60
1932 (six months)	46
1932 (June)	39
1932 (September)	38

It will be noted that, in the days of unparalleled prosperity (1927-1929), "the total amount paid out in wages by American manufacturers did not increase." It will be noted that the total wage payments began to decline immediately after the crash (in spite of President Hoover's appeal!), and today are only 38 per cent of what they were in 1929. The factor of unemployment is important here, but reductions in wage rates per hour or day are equally important. Now look, by way of contrast, at what corporations were doing through this same period for their investors! According to the Standard Satistics Company reports, says Professor Douglas, interest and dividend payments, reckoned on a par of 100 for the year 1926, moved as follows:

1927	129
1928	137
1929	173
1930	196
1931	187
1932 (estimated)	155-164

No drop here until 1931—two years after the crash! And even today, at the bottom of the worst depression in American history, our corporations are paying out in interest and dividends more than 50 per cent *more* than they were paying in 1926. Could anything show more clearly for whom this capitalistic system of ours is operated? Food may come, and food may go, but dividends go on forever!

The twelve greatest American women, recently chosen in a contest conducted by the National Council of Women and the *Ladies' Home Journal,* have their merits. No one would dispute the place upon such a list of Frances E. Willard, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Susan B. Anthony, Julia Ward Howe, and Mary Lyon. The preeminence of these women is incontestable. In the same way, among living women, we imagine that nobody would dispute the ascendency of Jane Addams and Helen Keller, except perhaps these women themselves. This gives us seven names universally acceptable. At the other end, we think it flatly ridiculous that Amelia Earhart Putnam should be included. We have great respect for Mrs. Putnam—she is brave, adventurous, above all modest. But it needs other qualities than these to win supremacy among millions of women in decades of years. In the same way we find it preposterous to include Mrs. Eddy. In terms of achievement, perhaps, yes; but achievement by what means, at what cost, and to what end? Dr. Mary E. Woolley is a not unworthy choice, but on what basis is she to be preferred to Alice Freeman Palmer? Carrie Chapman Catt is a truly great woman, but we think she would be the first to agree that Lucy Stone, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Anna Shaw were greater. Clara Barton is perhaps a wise choice, yet we wonder why she should be preferred to Dorothea Dix, or to Florence Kelley, Julia Lathrop, and Lillian Wold. Most amazing of the omissions is Mrs. Margaret Sanger, one of the great women of all time. Amazing also is the absence from the list of such distinguished literary figures as Margaret Fuller, Celia Thaxter, Emily Dick-

inson, Helen Hunt Jackson, Louise M. Alcott, and Mary E. Wilkins. And what about actresses—Charlotte Cushman, Julia Marlow, Mary Anderson? Then there are such women as Lucretia Mott, Abigail Adams, Elizabeth Peabody, Mary E. Livermore, Edith Wharton, Willa Cather, Zona Gale, and Sarah Orne Jewett. But perhaps we should be well content with the official list when we read that among the women who received votes in the contest were Mary Pickford, Mrs. Herbert Hoover, Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Alice Roosevelt Longworth, Mary Roberts Rinehart, and Anne Morrow Lindbergh. Why not, we ask, Carrie Nation, Dr. Mary Walker, Mrs. Bloomer, Annie Oakley, Victoria Woodhull, Eva Tanguay, Mae West, Texas Guinan, Ruth Elder, Gertrude Edeler, and the Sweet Singer of Michigan?

The retirement of Albert C. Dieffenbach, editor of the *Christian Register,* because of the financial difficulties of the paper, is a serious loss to religious journalism in America. We can think of few men who have made a more impressive success in this peculiarly difficult and discouraging field, and we count it a tragedy that he should now fall before forces so altogether beyond his power of control. It was fifteen years ago that Mr. Dieffenbach assumed direction of the *Register,* which was at that time a paper steeped in the fine tradition of Unitarianism, representing a culture of mind and liberality of spirit rare in the annals of religion. But its journalistic standards were conventional, and thus in aim and method quite out of touch with the changing influences of the time. It was an excellent denominational organ—in the general quality of its contents, perhaps the best in the country. But a new age had come; the *Register* was aware of it; but for a period of years its consciousness of the need of change was shown only by an *ad interim* kind of policy which was necessarily uncertain, timid, and confused. Then came Mr. Dieffenbach, with his journalistic experience, his genuine editorial *flair,* his clear and bold convictions, his forthright utterance, and his straight steering of a course of action. More than once Mr. Dieffenbach has gotten into hot water, and has thus renewed the experience of every man who says his say in reckless disregard of consequences. But mostly his troubles have come from his wholesome disregard of the all too sensitive respectability of his Unitarian constituency. Certainly one thing is clear—and that is that Mr. Dieffenbach made the *Christian Register* an influence in the land. A purely parochial paper, he made it, by the personal power of his leadership, a national organ of free religion. In all the discussions and controversies of the day, notably the Fundamentalist flurry, Dieffenbach's *Register* was heard and heeded, and that is the final journalistic test. We have had our disputes with Mr. Dieffenbach, and they have been sharply stated on both sides. But we always profoundly admired him, and shall now miss sorely his inspiring and challenging presence.

Let's Be Fair—and Wise!

A while ago a broadcaster sponsored by the church federations tied to an incident in Russia, by a very loose knot, a homily on the superiority of Christianity to Communism. He displayed them in parallel columns, so to speak. He gave the comparison an appearance of fairness by admitting the identity of certain ideals in the two systems. But the essential unfairness of the whole comparison did not seem to occur to him.

The Communism of Russia is not a congeries of glowing ideals, but a going concern, a social program actually in operation. The observer inevitably judges it by its demonstrations as well as by its theories. Bearing the sweat and scars of its hard day's work our broadcaster compares it with a beautiful collection of ideals untarnished by serious attempt at realization in a working social program, a theoretical scheme which he and his sponsors are pleased to call Christianity. History knows little or nothing of this Christianity. What has gone by the name through the past two millenia is not what he is talking about. The Russian with a memory fifteen years old would certainly not recognize this Christianity. Western sponsors are among the most outspoken in repudiating the Christianity of the old Russian church, the fawning lackey of the Czarist regime.

Here is exemplified the common practice of Christian apologists. They draw the deadly parallel between their untried social ideals and the various religious programs which have been bearing the heat and burden of many a long day of actual application to human conditions and social strain. For the Christianity of these comparisons is still a social aspiration, not a successful achievement. Following the world war, when disillusioned observers noted the havoc of spiritual ideals, and declared that Christianity had failed in the world's great crisis, an eminent prelate of the Anglican church came forward with the defense, "No, Christianity has not failed; it has never been tried." This stupid remark has probably been repeated by direct quotation or in substance in every American Christian pulpit. It is the accepted Christian apologia of the day. And its stupidity seems still not to have dawned upon the minds of those who use it.

If Christianity is conceived as a counsel of personal loyalty to a sacrificial life lived something less than 2000 years ago, in protest against the social conditions then prevailing, and if allegiance is to be tested

by a similarly determined protest against the social conditions in which any individual life may be immersed, then of course Christianity is not a social system and has no social program to offer. It is what many of its apologists in every generation have stoutly maintained that it is, a counsel of otherworldliness. It is a permanent protest against human society and its ineradicable depravity. Manifestly no comparisons can be instituted between such a system and practical social programs which are aimed at making human life livable here and now, and human society a stable and self-sufficient reality.

If, on the other hand, Christianity is conceived to be a social system and to offer a program for human society, it still must be recognized as an ideal, unrealized today anywhere in the world, and never having been realized in any considerable human community. This should never be overlooked when comparisons are instituted. Like should be compared with like. Those who cherish this ideal should be asked first of all to clear their conceptions of verbiage unintelligible in the common speech of the day. Not, what are the glories of the Kingdom of God? but, what would Christianity actually do to the various institutions essential to modern society? How would a Christian community function, if there should be such a thing actually produced? At least his vision should be visualized before the Christian apologist essays to compare it with a social system in actual operation.

Similar considerations may well be urged upon propagandists for Socialism. The common practice is to draw the deadly parallel between it and Capitalism. Most overlook the fact that such comparisons are made between, on the one hand, a bright, new ideal, untarnished by practical operation in an actual human community, and, on the other hand, a poor bedrabbled, hard-beset social program which nobody is ready fully to sponsor and whose very name has been fastened upon it by its enemies. There really is no common nature between these two systems which will permit fair comparison. Capitalism is not a reasoned-out social system; it is simply a way of getting along which has been wrought out by generations of blundering, bewildered human groups, guided in the process by their passions more than by their reason. Socialist propagandists are accustomed sonorously to attack the defenders of Capitalism. Where are these defenders, and who are they? Nobody defends Capitalism as a social system, certainly not as a complete and final system. Numbers may be found to defend the *status quo*. But that is true in the society of Dahomey. It is also doubtless true in hell, though verified reports are not at hand to vouch for the assertion. Capitalism is essentially unlike Socialism in that it is the product of experiment in human relations; it has no philosophy back of it and no method of correcting its defects except more experiment. Socialism is a theory, a carefully wrought theory, and as yet only a theory. There is nowhere in the world a laboratory demonstration by which its excellencies can be pragmatically judged. It enjoys all the advantages and labors under the limitations of this *status*. These advantages are great when comparisons are being made. Its failures cannot be scored against it for it has no failures. Its successes can be made to glow with all the sheen of their theoretical nature. The record of Socialism where it has been tried may or may not be embarrassing to propagandists. Cavillers may be told that it has never had a fair chance, but the assertion cannot be used to justify unfavorable comparisons between it and systems which have taken such chances as there are, and have made the best of them in actual operation. The German Republic is a Socialism in name. Its first President lived and died an ardent Socialist, and the founders of the new German state professed and, for at least a time, believed that they were establishing a Socialist order. Nobody cares to acknowledge the German government of today as a fair demonstration of Socialism. M. Briand was an ardent Socialist in his youth. None points to his statesmanship, brilliant as it was, as a conclusive demonstration of Socialism. The present dictator of Poland was likewise a Socialist in his youth. Poland is not today exactly what anybody conceives as Socialism. Mussolini was a red-hot Socialist a few years ago. Socialists do not point with pride in the direction of Italy. And what shall be said of Ramsay MacDonald, and his two Socialist governments in Britain? Our propagandist may insist upon pointing to the fact that neither of these governments had a mandate from the majority of Britain's voters, and that Ramsay MacDonald in his extremity has surrendered his Socialism and now leads a Tory government. These are doubtless facts but they are not to the present point. It is only clear that Socialism has failed where it has been tried all over the modern world, and the propagandist who thrusts forward the system in deadly comparison with going social programs must resort to the stupid defense that it has not had a "chance."

This stupidity on the part of its sponsors sadly holds back Socialism, especially in America. Offered to the American people as a complete economic and social system, it is classified by them as a social goldbrick, ranking among many others which have preceded it. This method of propaganda sacrifices Socialism's essential nature as an ideal. An ideal is not a blueprint with all the lines drawn in sharp and clear. It is not a sure-fire gun warranted to slaughter all of the enemies of righteousness at one blast. It is not a panacea for all economic and social ills, to be swallowed at night with the rosy assurance that all will be well the morning after.

The American people do not fancy being handed that kind of stuff. They want to be thrilled by the

divine uncertainties of reasoned social progress. They wait to be enlisted in a great adventure, not asking nor indeed desiring that each step of the course shall be marked out in advance. They would be challenged to initiative, not to slavish imitation. They are tired, oh, how tired, of having Russia pointed out as the final and conclusive word in human progress. They would not duplicate Russia in America if its streets were paved with gold and its cities shut in by pearly gates. In heaven's name let us quit offering American communities ready-made social systems. They have been blundering on as best they could so far, and they are not unmindful of a certain degree of success in their past adventures. They want more of these adventures. They do not wish to be told that all that they have ever done and all that the fathers did before them is but dust and ashes, and that they must sweep the ground clear. Those whose following will count at all are not disposed slavishly to defend the *status quo*. They have no "system" to preserve. The social order under which they have made their past progress is not to them a capitalism. They are not to the slightest degree interested in it or in any other as a "system." They are out for high adventure in their own happiness, in the welfare of their children, and in service to humanity. In that pursuit they will insist upon being allowed a large degree of originality, and upon the exercise of their own initiative. They will in the end follow leaders who have a vision, not apothecaries who offer them social pills.

The times are ripe for this kind of leadership. No breath need be wasted in vituperation of "defenders of the present iniquitous social order." Forget them! Those who are content with the *status quo* are content. Nothing can be made of them in any case. Progress can be hoped for only from those who are not content. They seek leadership, hopeful, visionful, unafraid, too ardent for advance into the new and better day to be at pains to display the obliquities of a conjured-up monster which some may be pleased to damn with the awful name of Capitalism.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

BOOTLEG PRICES RISE FOURFOLD IN CANADA

MONTREAL, Dec. 21.—Bootleg liquor in Canada has increased fourfold in price, because of the Christmas demands, with scarcity reported.

Scarcity of liquor is believed due to several big raids by Quebec Liquor Commission men in both Montreal and Quebec districts.

What! Bootleggers in Canada? Why, they have abolished Prohibition in Canada, and have an ideal liquor law there. Can it be possible that repealing Prohibition accomplishes nothing?

We watched an aviator writing advertising legends upon the sky the other day—and he mis-spelled a word! What cosmic punishment is fit for so celestial an error?

Bernard Shaw and Jimmie Walker journeyed on the same boat the other day. It is not reported that the playwright spoke to or even saw the ex-mayor, but Jimmie gave out an interview on what he thought of Shaw. Thus may a cat look at a king, or a mud-worm at a star!

B. C. (Before Christ); A. D. (*Anno Domini,* in the Year of our Lord); B. D. (Before the Depression). The three great periods of history!

There are some new stories so unimportant that they are not worth the cable charges. Such a story is that of the adjournment of the third and last Round Table Conference on Indian affairs. What this Conference has done, or not done, matters not at all. Indian affairs are being settled not at St. James' Palace but in Poona Jail.

A group of newspapermen raised the question as to the deaths of what ten men, come suddenly and without warning, would most stir the world as measured by newspaper space and by intensity and range of public interest. The consensus of opinion centered upon the following: Gandhi, Stalin, Mussolini, the Prince of Wales, the Pope of Rome, Bernard Shaw, Albert Einstein, Henry Ford, Lindbergh, and Charlie Chaplin.

J. H. H.

My Neighbor

This is my neighbor coming down the street:
Approaching with severe averted eyes
He never sees me when we chance to meet;
A patriotic passion in him lies
That builds his moral wall. I am to feel
The disapproval of his rectitude;
For laws are laws to be enforced with zeal—
Not on the privileged but the multitude—
And I rebelled one time . . . Wherefore our feud.

He lives by writing. Heinous homilies
Drip from his pen with chauvinistic screed
Of fulsome self-esteem—half-truths, half lies;
No man escapes him daily who can read,
And virtue is the armor of his wealth.
Yet I have learned that even he can use
A quart of gin betimes—purchased by stealth.
He has a poker face . . . Wherefore I choose
To study his passing feet, his English shoes!

BRENT ALLINSON.

Albert Schweitzer*

Romance has not yet disappeared from this practical world of the nineteen-thirties, even though it embodies itself in commonplace happenings.

The Earliest Chapter

During the Spring of 1929 I was strolling from lodgings in the Schoenfeldstrasse, Munich, through a quiet back street toward the Odeonsplatz. I caught sight of a poster announcing that Albert Schweitzer would give a lecture on Sebastian Bach in the Tonhalle on Wednesday and would play some Bach organ works in the Matthäus-Kirche on Thursday. I knew that Schweitzer had written a book on Sebastian Bach worthy of being purchased immediately upon its appearance, and I welcomed the opportunities to hear him talk and perform. Arriving at the Tonhalle a few minutes before the hour of the lecture, I found the lobby crowded with people and the box-office so surrounded that I could not reach it. "Standing Room Only" was bulletined or cried; and the eagerness of the people near the box-office indicated a scant supply of admission-tickets. The presiding fairy in my romance sent along a Schweitzer devotee with a liberated ticket for a good seat.

Schweitzer came on the platform, dressed in a none-too-well-tailored business-suit. There was no chairman to introduce him. He began: "Sebastian Bach was born at Eisenach on the 21st of March, 1685." He continued, without notes and without oratory, for an hour and three quarters to an audience of about eighteen hundred, several hundred of whom were standing, and not a person observably left the hall.

The Latest Chapter

(A letter, reproduced *"literatim et punctuatim"*)

Hôpital du Dr. Schweitzer
Lambarene
Afrique Equatoriale Française
par Bordeaux-Port-Gentil
June 9, 1931

Dear Sir:

Just a few words with some news from Lambarene. Doctor Schweitzer asks me to say you his best greetings. For the moment he is finishing the case for tuberculosis patients and another case with four rooms to lodge black helpers. Doctor Schweitzer is back since a year and a half. Madam Schweitzer having made the voyage together with the Doctor unhappily could not stay. The heat of Equatorial Africa was too bad for her, she had to return to Europe after a few months stay. Doctor Schweitzer is assisted in his work here by 2 European doctors and 7 nurses and every one has a lot to do. Perhaps it will interest you to hear that now Doctor Schweitzer's books shall appear with an American editor. Since a long time the Doctor has been asked to do so, but his work did not allow him to look for it.

A few weeks ago I have been abroad together with our lady-doctor. We have travelled from village to village to help sick natives who never saw a doctor. We have walked for about 800 km. in the mountains, through large forests with elefants and tigers in, we had to step through waters and "Sumpf," but we could do a lot of good deeds with the medicaments we had with us. Ten natives accompanied us, carrying our luggage with medicaments, instruments and food. Every where the natives have been surprised to see us, often they never had seen a white lady or a white person before us. Generally they took willingly the drugs we could give them. A lot of the sick people we saw, should have a longer stay in the hospital. We told them so, hoping they will follow our advice.

Sending you the best greetings from Lambarene I remaine respectfully

Yours Emma Haussknecht.

Lieber Herr Lewis.—Tausend Dank für Ihre lieben Zeilen! Hoffentlich ist uns ein Wiedersehn beschieden. Alle Brief- und Drucksachen immer über Günsbach schicken—das ist das einzig sichere! Tausend Dank zum Voraus. Ihr ergebener

Albert Schweitzer.

Permanente Adresse:
Dr. Albert Schweitzer
Günsbach bei Münster, Elsass
von hier werden alle Postsachen nach Afrika nachgeschickt.

Interlude

Between these earliest and latest chapters lay a period of a little more than two years, during which, from time to time, acquaintance with the geographically distant Schweitzer was sporadically cultivated.

After the Tonhalle lecture, I made my way to the corridor near the stairs leading to the stage, intending to ask Schweitzer about a possible trip to America. I found him surrounded by a group of a half-dozen rural house-wives, behind whom were massed perhaps fifty Munich dignitaries. Schweitzer showed no interest in the dignitaries. He was carrying on an animated (one might almost call it chattering) conversation with the women, chiefly concerning domestic happenings to Johann This and Maria That and Heinrich So-and-So and Elsa Somebody-Else, whom, as I later guessed, he had known during his pastorate in a little Alsatian town. I was, of course, impressed by this friendly interest of an internationally famous musician in the small affairs of humble people, but was getting a bit impatient at not being able to get at the hero of the hour, when an accommodating young person, later identified as an employee of Schweitzer's Munich publisher, asked if I wanted to see Schweitzer and suggested that I come around to "the hotel" after the concert the next evening. "The hotel" meant nothing to me; but the off-hand cordiality of the young man made me hopeful of finding out in good season, and I presently went away, along with the diminishing group of dignitaries who had come to the conclusion that it wasn't worth while to wait for Schweitzer to finish with the smalltown people.

The concert the next evening was so crowded that, not having provided myself with a reserved seat, I had to stand during the entire course of it. This time I got an opportunity to exchange a few words with Schweitzer and received from him an invitation to join the rest at "the hotel," which I found to be diagonally across the side street.

Having arrived there and finding many persons entering, I hesitated to join what might be a "closed group." But Schweitzer appeared and, catching sight of me, spoke the necessary word of kindly invitation to "come along with."

We entered a large sub-hall of the Gasthaus, sprinkled liberally with small tables at which the people were taking their seats informally. It was a thoroughly German gathering, each person ordering and paying for what he consumed. Presently, Miss Haussknecht (Schweitzer's secretary) came around to my table, and I began to learn things. Schweitzer circulated actively. When my turn came, I had picked up material for a quarter-hour of rapid-fire questions and answers. Later I called on his publisher, learned more definitely about his books, and filled in my outline of the career of this remarkable personage.

But I ought not to use the term "personage," as

* The great German scholar, musician, and medical missionary, rated with Gandhi and Kagawa as one of the saints of the modern world.—Editor.

Schweitzer is, above all, a human creature who almost violently, though always quietly, discourages any tendency to treat him as extraordinary.

Postlude

As my information concerning him increased, there grew an ambition to bring about the foundation of an American Schweitzer Society, similar to that which has existed for several years in England with headquarters at Castleton Mansions, in London. The task of preparing and circulating the necessary propaganda turned out to be, prospectively, too great; and then the business depression came to make the enterprise quite untimely. These conditions still prevail, of course; but one new recent feature may make practicable the beginning of an association.

Epilogue

This new feature is the publication in English of two books: Schweitzer's "The Forest Hospital at Lambarene," and John D. Regester's "Albert Schweitzer"; and the announcement of a translation of Schweitzer's *"Selbstdarstellung"* under the English title "My Life and Thought."

It will presently be possible for the English-reading public to become informed concerning a man who holds three academic degrees taken in course, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Theology, Doctor of Medicine, as well as honorary degrees from English and Continental Universities; who is the greatest living authority on John Sebastian Bach; whose works on Kant's "Philosophy of Religion," on "The Quest of the Historical Jesus," on "Paul and His Interpreters," on "Civilization and Ethics," on "Christianity and World-Religion," on "The Psychiatric Opinion Concerning Jesus," on "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle" have enriched and have, in noteworthy degree, revolutionized thought and opinion; and who spends the major part of his time and all the money he can earn or collect in the service of the blacks of Equatorial Africa.

Leo Rich Lewis.

Department of Music,
Tufts College, Massachusetts.

The Value of the Voice of the People

It is a sobering thought that some of the greatest leaders of men have been, in a sense, distrustful of the voice of the people. The essence of the great temptation of Jesus was a suggested short cut to popularity. He carefully avoided adapting his opinions to the whims of the masses. He sought to train a few leaders, and to his sorrow they were often wrong. They forced him to exclaim, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken!" In line with this is Wiggam's statement that the people are always wrong.

Alexander Hamilton said that the majority of the people were not able to vote intelligently and for that reason government should be left in the hands of the few who by training and intelligence were fitted for it. Though Thomas Jefferson believed the people should rule he emphasized the fact that a democracy could not endure unless the people were educated. Therefore he established the University of Virginia and in other ways exerted a great influence along this line. He believed that the populace should have the chance of learning by trial and error to rule. He knew that they would not always be right but that they had the right to learn by experience. Woodrow Wilson contended that he as president should direct legislation but when he met with opposition from the vested interests he revealed to the nation just how his measures were being held up. He counted on the moral support of the public to force through Congress his tariff and financial reforms and he was not disappointed.

Of what value then is the voice of the people? It can be depended upon to take the side which seems to be right. The trouble is things are so often not what they seem to be. That is where the people lose out. They jump to conclusions. They speak without due consideration. They are not trained to get all or sufficient facts upon which to base judgment. The people are always led. Their leaders may be prophets or demons, and how much depends on which! The mob that howls for the life of a cringing Negro is led by a nucleus of lawless souls who protect themselves by the crowd until the deed is done and then slink away to laugh at the silly rabble who followed. Not so spectacular but none the less insidious is the infection produced by our cheap newspapers. The man who delivers my papers tells me that by far the majority of papers delivered in this borough are the sensational type. How much intelligent action can we expect from those who read such stuff?

We are told that three-fourths of the people in this nation want the Eighteenth Amendment repealed. Maybe that is true. If so they have a perfect right to repeal it or else we might as well admit that popular rule is no more. But even if they do want the Amendment changed does that necessarily mean that they are right? Perhaps it only means that they have short memories. It may mean that they are just being led backwards. The papers accuse prohibition of producing all kinds of crime, municipal corruption, and racketeering. Why do not the papers accuse the automobile in connection with crime for how much could the modern racketeer do without it? If prohibition caused the rotten condition in New York today what caused it during Boss Tweed's regime? And I wonder why my paper a few days ago relegated to a remote section a little six-line item telling how Canada had placed ten airplanes in service in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to check the rum-runners while daily it features on the front page instances of rum-running in the United States? The people have very little discrimination, and when they are continually fed on propaganda they fall beneath its power. I believe that most of the people who are asking for a change in our liquor laws are sincere in believing a change would be better. But I cannot say with equal freedom that I believe they are right in so doing.

There are so many illustrations that could be used in this connection. Reform movements are slow because the people while wanting better conditions are not able to comprehend the best means of attaining them. What workingman in America would not like to see more stable conditions in industry and a more equitable distribution of the returns from labor? But our workingmen are afraid of innovations in the old system. I was talking with the delegate of the masons' union here and when I asked if any mention was ever made of socialistic doctrine in his meetings he was very indignant. He assured me that they never tolerated

anything of the kind and that there was a thousand dollar fine for allowing socialistic propaganda in their lodges. With such ironclad rules it may be a long time before the people see a better way than our historic "rugged individualism" which has all but ruined the world. Can I doubt that fellow's good intentions? Not in the least, but I would hate to see the industrial world try much longer to go on in his way.

In times of comparative peace like these I suppose it is a safe position to take in saying that most of the people want permanent peace. No doubt a few degenerate souls would be pleased with another war so they could make quick money. But the majority want to do away with war forever. Again we can count on the people to be on the right side basically. However, when we go a little further and discuss means of getting rid of war we find almost hopeless confusion of thought. The militarists have made a good job for themselves in teaching the people that the way to keep peace is to prepare for war. If the majority could see one inch beyond their noses they would see the perfect folly in such statements. And so the great longsuffering human family goes on forever piling up armaments to be used in keeping us out of war when if there is any lesson taught by experience it is that armaments produce wars. When will the good people learn?

It is discouraging to bother with the people at all. They are so slow to see the right way. Why not call them "cattle" and be done with it? They have good intentions but that is not enough. They are shortsighted. They are fickle. Jesus rode into Jerusalem with the acclaim of the people but a few days later probably some of them were of the mob shouting, "Crucify him!" This was not his first such experience. He had endured enough at the hands of fickle and shallow people to make him give them up in despair. But the inspiring part of his life is the fact that he did not despair. He loved men when they were unlovely, and believed in them though there was not much in them to inspire faith. He lived and died to reconstruct them. He saw men, as one of his devotees said, with a zeal of God but not according to knowledge, and he taught them the proper correlation of zeal and knowledge.

Contrary to the old ideas of life we find ourselves in a world of people who are right at heart. They mean well. The most vivid recent proof of this was the unanimous outcry of the entire world against the kidnapping of the Lindbergh baby. The radio announcers gave out news briefs with voices subdued with sympathetic anguish. The only discordant note I heard in all the news was from one fellow who spoke of "This case which becomes more interesting every hour." I cut him off at once. If the world were only as intelligent as it is goodhearted! Well, in spite of all there is much to produce good cheer. As Daniel Webster said, the world never entirely loses what is added to its store of knowledge. Our privilege is to educate the people so that their voice shall not be an uncertain quantity but an irresistible intelligent expression.

FRANK S. HARWOOD.

Women and War

To the popular imagination the terms "Women" and "War" symbolize conflict. Polarities of antipathetic character! In militaristic diatribes against pacifists, women and male weaklings invariably make up the objectionable opposition. And it is to the "weak" males of this group that the warnings of effeminization are levelled.

Pacifists are optimistically eager to believe that women are inherently peace-lovers and conservers of life. They place a high degree of value upon this presumption. Benjamin Kidd and many reputable writers and thinkers of the past believed that women made for peace. Some moderns accept this opinion without question, while others, particularly psychologists and historians, have begun to doubt the correctness of the conclusion, since many things that men have thought about women are being daily proved wrong.

Contrary to the militarists' fears and the pacifists' hopes, women, taken *en masse,* are no less militaristic—frequently are more militaristic—than their male fellows. When the proposition of peace becomes paramount to the rank and file of people there will be no sex distinctions perceivable. To state dogmatically that women are on a parity with men in their zeal for war and the congeniality of war rationalization may be considered impudent as well as impolitic, but such ventures must occasionally be made to obviate over-confidence or a slackening of effort in the cause of humanity and international comity.

The Vaertings, in their book, "The Dominant Sex," suggest that by the abuse of power the dominant sex (whether male or female) evokes the forces that will end its power. "Power becomes stronger than those who wield it, and brings even them under its sway." A further suggestion, enunciated by Bousfield in his book, "Sex and Civilization," offers the opinion that ignorance of the facts concerning war and the psychology of war, particularly pertaining to women, prevents the real progress of peace movements. He states, "It appears quite possible that as long as in any of our domains, whether social or directly sexual, sex dominance remains, there is a tendency to displace primitive desires for power from one sphere to another; that is to say, very possibly from sex dominance to caste dominance and from this to the dominance of nations, and thus as long as there is any sex dominance such a thing as world peace may be psychologically impossible. That is to say, whatever institutions are developed to maintain peace, they may very likely be futile so long as psychological factors of the transfer of ideas of dominance are not taken into consideration. So that it appears possible that the distant prospects of world peace ultimately may be dependent on the attainment of sex-equality."

There is work ahead for the humanitarian who holds to the ideal of peace on earth and good will to men and women and children. For despite the progress made in intellectualizing the facts, so that more rationalizing is recorded on the side of peace, there is a wilderness of social traditions and aggressive concepts of life to cultivate and save from its own destructive potentialities. May not the cause be advanced by a better understanding of the human mind and its proclivities, and a safer and saner approach of the enemy be assured by a revamping of old ideas and an honest-to-goodness look in the face of the true facts involved?

LILLIAN A. GARING.

The Acme of Sensitiveness

Our childhood interest was excited by the tale of the Princess who was hurt by sleeping on a most thickly upholstered pea. The royal young lady, as we recall the story, was in exile, or lost on a journey, and could not at first persuade the humble folk from whom she asked a night's lodging, that she really was a princess. To test her claim, they secretly inserted one little hard pea far beneath twenty mattresses and many quilts, which they had piled in a soft tower upon the bed where she was to repose.

Behold, the next morning the visitor appeared at the breakfast table, haggard and weary, announcing that not only had she been unable to sleep, but that her body was black-and-blue from bruises inflicted by some foreign object in her bed! Thereupon her doubting hosts, realizing that nothing less delicate than the fiber of a princess could have been so cruelly tormented by the pea through its enormous cushioning, paid her belated but enthusiastic homage as unquestionably royal.

Little did we think, in early enjoyment of this tale, that we should ever find its counterpart in real life. But its classic example of exquisite sensitiveness is fully matched by the highly-keyed master of profits in modern industry, who also contributes to organized religion the encouragement of his attendance and financial support. Although his rector or pastor may never before have offended the wealthy parishioner's sensorium by the slightest trespass upon the forbidden terrain of radicalism in economics and social relations, nevertheless a single little sentence in his sermon which betrays such presumption, will not fail to arouse swiftest protest against the injury it wreaks.

Yes, even through the many mattresses of the preacher's introduction, exhortation and peroration, and through all the quilts of gentle exegesis, Bible history, and reproof of the transgressions of lesser offenders, the single hard and valiant little pea suggestion that something is fundamentally wrong with the dominant system of profits, banking, and the claim to private ownership of public necessities, will render the influential layman's class instinct and economic vigilance as "black-and-blue" as the Princess' racked form on her deeply cushioned couch. So he is proved indubitably royal, and the sooner he receives his unquestioning homage, the better will it be for the hesitant subject.

The bruised one must "speak to the 'Doctor' at once!" And speak he does, suavely at first, but with steel inside the velvet scabbard. He urges avoidance of the controversial and "dangerous" topics of vested rights, and legalized ownership, of profit-making and approaching social overturn. "Stick to the simple Gospel, Doctor!" And if the minister then reminds him that it is impossible to do that without declaring it God's will to have all his people enjoy in common the land and all its sub-surface treasures which he has made theirs by his free gift forever; adding Christ's affirming promise that the meek shall inherit the earth, to supersede its present alleged ownership, by a minority by no means meek, which leaves the vast majority disinherited, enslaved, and even starved—then the influential layman whose sensitive princeliness has been so convincingly proved, will let the steel glint from the velvet:

> Very well, Doctor, if there is any more of such subversive and inflammatory preaching in the future, it will compel me to cancel my subscriptions to the Endowment Fund and the current expenses of this parish, and betake myself and my family elsewhere, in the hope of hearing sermons uncolored by communistic theory!*

And the minister?—is it courage or submission for him? And henceforth is it the Gospel according to Saints Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, or that according to the modern Mammon, that he will preach? It cannot possibly be both. The sterner call to the church!

(Rev.) Eliot White.

*This paragraph is vouched for by the author as a verbatim statement made not so long ago to a famous New York clergyman by a departing parishioner, vice-president of a great public service corporation.—Editor.

Mona Lisa in the Slums

She woke to find the room was chill,
Herself in shivers
And the children whimpering in their beds,
"It is so cold, so cold!"

All in one bed she piled them,
The covers from the two,
Ill-barring out the cold,
And stopped their hunger cries
With promises.

Taking her pail
She slipped outside
To pick up anything
That chance or God had dropped
For human sparrows.
Old Rook, the hunted,
Joined her in the search
And feigned to find the offerings
That he dropped in her bucket—
He lived by those deft fingers.

Honk! A Christmas party rushes past
To worship Christ in some warm church,
And one cries out, "A merry Christmas!"
A ragged boy with bell and placard,
Stops for them to read:
"A Christmas sermon on the street
To tell of Christ
Who loves, and came to save all men."
Shifty eyes met bitter ones.

Talk of inscrutable smiles—
Had you seen his and hers,
You'd never waste your time again,
On Mona Lisa's!

Eva Warner.

Wouldst Thou Have Peace

Wouldst thou have peace
From hatred cease,
And keep thy mind
From thoughts unkind!

Resist not those
Who thee oppose,
Nor draw from them
Thy garment's hem!

Whoso is wise
With friendly eyes
Will seek to scan
His fellowman.

Yea, friend of mine,
With love divine
Compassion show
To all below.

With gentle grace
All evil face
And love's increase
Shall bring thee peace.

Victor E. Southworth.

The Study Table

The Gentle Art of Misinformation

Any man who is in the public eye is fair game for the journalist who desires to make a little easy money. This is a biographical age. The public seems to be hungry for the life story of most any person who is famous or infamous. To produce such a biography all the journalist has to do is to go through the files of the magazines and daily press and from these put together a book. It is an easy thing to do for all his documents are at hand. The public, at least the public that reads the book, seemingly requires very little of what the scholars call research. The less investigation the better, for the slightest inquiry might puncture a very good story. Tabloid stuff in book form may not be a very high form of literature but nevertheless to some minds it may be very entertaining.

Of all the living men who have been subjected to publicity Henry Ford is probably the biggest game for the biography hunter. He began life as a poor boy. He was not born in a log cabin, but the next thing to it. He lived simply and obscurely for forty years. Then he began an amazing career which resulted in his being known within a few years in every nook and corner of the world. He made fifteen million automobiles known as Model T's. Having immense wealth he did not use it for ostentatious and vulgar display. He became, as if by magic, a leader in the world of industry. He had opinions on all sorts of subjects, which he freely expressed, and which, because reinforced by the sounding board of a million dollars, reverberated throughout the entire world.

Mr. Jonathan Leonard, who has written the latest* of the Henry Ford biographies, has given piquancy to his book by giving it the title of "The Tragedy of Henry Ford." Just why the life of Mr. Ford should be considered a tragedy is a bit difficult to understand. There may be an element of pathos in the effect of a billion dollars on a single personality. If Mr. Ford is a prophet of our capitalistic system it might seem well to reserve the word tragedy for the victims of the system. However, it is a title that is attractive, and I suppose it will contribute to the volume of sales, a matter which the author holds in contempt when it comes to Model T's.

The publishers speak of this book as being full of new material. As a matter of fact a very large portion of the book is simply lifted from the newspapers, and the rest of it, for that matter, has been the public's property for years. Mr. Leonard pictures Henry Ford as a distracted idealist who has failed to discover any fundamental central principle for the guidance of his life. It is not my purpose to write a defense of Henry Ford. There is nothing very mysterious or strange about his career. He is, it is true, a somewhat rare combination of mechanic and good business man. By happy chance he was born at a time when the gasoline engine was being developed. He had dreamed in his boyhood of mass production as a method of making available to a large number of people the luxuries enjoyed only by the few. This idea he applied to the automobile and lo, he became almost over night one of the world's richest men. His reaction to wealth has been practically the same as that of thousands of other men. It gave him a sense of power. His wealth became, if not his master, at least an encumbrance, and in order to protect himself he, as thousands of other men have done, surrounded himself with private secretaries in order that he might have freedom to move about. But all this certainly does not warrant the statement that "around this strange man have centered more worship, more hatred, more perplexity than around any other private citizen in history." The whole book is written after the style of the above statement. It is the *Daily Mirror* in book form.

Mr. Leonard has only contempt for "Model T" which the writer, as the owner of six of these vehicles, built "to get you anywhere," does not share. Mr. Ford's adventure into the jungles and swamps of anti-Semitism was as unfortunate and ridiculous as Mr. Leonard says it was. To charge that the system in the Ford factory debases men in body and soul, Mr. Ford and his supporters have replied many times. The truth is that Mr. Ford is not the originator of mass production nor the discoverer of the speeding up system. Any charges in this matter should be brought against the capitalistic system of which Mr. Ford is a part. It is only fair to Mr. Ford to say that he believes that a very large number of men easily accustom themselves to monotonous work and that the short hour day gives the individual plenty of time to escape the effects of routine toil. Mr. Leonard writes as though Mr. Ford was primarily responsible for a system which has spread throughout the modern industrial world, which of course he is not.

A very large portion, fifty or more pages of Mr. Leonard's book, is given over to the Ford Peace Ship. Space is not available to tell the true story of the Ford Peace Party, and even if it were, it would hardly be necessary to tell it to the readers of UNITY. Mr. Leonard has relied entirely upon certain newspaper accounts which, as a journalist, he ought to know would be important if true. There appeared at the time in two newspapers, the Boston *Daily Advertizer* and the Chattanooga *Daily News*, reports of the Ford Peace Expedition in the form of letters from correspondents. The story of the expedition appeared in the *Survey* and in the *National Organ* of the Yeomen of America. There has also appeared a book written by the secretary of the expedition, Louis B. Lockner. Madame Rosika Schwimmer, the organizer of the expedition, lives in New York and might have been interviewed in reference to the Ford Peace Party. But Mr. Leonard apparently sought none of these sources of information. If he did he allows no evidence of it to appear in his book. His story is entirely built upon the telegraphed or cabled newspaper reports to New York papers, the writers of which were referred to by one of their own number as "the dirtiest bunch of pirates that ever scuttled a ship." I would not say that of them but the justification for the remark lies in the fact that these reporters accepted

*The Tragedy of Henry Ford, by Jonathan Norton Leonard, G. P. Putnam Sons.

the hospitality of Mr. Ford and then egregiously lied about him. The reporter of one of the leading New York papers said to the writer, "Henry Ford ought not to blame a fellow for writing the stuff he does when he has to do it to keep his job." Another representative of a syndicate of newspapers said, "The boys are ashamed of what they have done but they had to do it." I suppose these men are to be pitied rather than to be blamed. The fact is that there were no fights among the members of the Ford Peace Expedition, no revolvers were drawn and no police were called in to settle differences. Henry Ford, in his telegram inviting people to go with him stated that the purpose of the expedition was to "establish an international conference dedicated to negotiation leading to a just settlement of the war." It was to this end that the Ford Peace Expedition went to Europe. There were held in four neutral countries, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, public meetings at which the fundamental purpose of the expedition was set forth. In all these countries the Ford Peace Party was joined by leading statesmen and publicists. These gave to the party their whole-hearted support. At the Hague the purpose of the party was realized by the establishment of the International Conference which functioned in Stockholm until almost the time of America's entry into the war. The Ford Peace Party may be a joke to Mr. Leonard but to the people of Europe, broken and beaten by the war, it came as a ray of light in the darkness. There is every evidence that civilians in the belligerent countries hoped and prayed that something might come out of this appeal to what was left of sanity and reason among the nations of the world. It is also true that whenever soldiers learned of the attempt they too hoped that Mr. Ford's appeal might not be in vain.

If it were not for the repetition of these flagrant misrepresentations of the Ford Peace Party Mr. Leonard's book would not warrant mention in the pages of UNITY.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

The Crisis in Modern Jewry

Of the seventeen essays making up this volume* only three were written within the present year. The others were published at varying times between 1909 and 1930. Either the problem of the Jew has not changed since 1909 or else the author, Dr. Horace Kallen, has so complete a grasp upon it that as far back as twenty years ago he sensed our approaching difficulties. At that time only the rare student of Jewish affairs understood the modern trend of Judaism well enough to comprehend what Dr. Kallen meant when he spoke of "Hebraism." Today there is a school, perhaps small in number but certainly large in influence, which not only comprehends but also follows this interpretation of Jewish life in America.

This school of thought accepts the idea that Judaism and Jewishness are two different things; that "while Judaism has been alienated from the Jewish people, Jewishness is a Jewish way of life become necessarily secular, humanist, scientific, conditioned on the industrial economy, without having ceased to be livingly Jewish." Judaism, especially as represented in Reform, says Dr. Kallen, has failed to keep alive the true religious, the true Jewish feeling of the Jew. True Judaism has always concerned itself with life; "the joy of the law," the orthodox Rabbis called it. But it was never a dead law! it was a living, throbbing, advancing code of life, growing as new needs presented themselves to the Jew. And it was always distinctly Jewish!

This distinctiveness is what makes any religion worth while. Reform Judaism has been mistaken in its ideal of "universal brotherhood," says Dr. Kallen. Only "by being most itself, by making the most of its individuality" can any group make contribution to the progress of society. What really destroys the Jews is what "universalizes" them, what empties their lives of particular content and substitutes therefor void phrases to be filled with any meaning the social and religious fashion of the day form. If the Jew is to be worthy of a place in life it can only be because he has his own, his distinct contribution to make to life.

Reform Judaism is not unaware of this fact, therefore in the early days especially it made much of the statement that the Jew had a "mission" to perform in society. But Dr. Kallen classes this "mission" idea as a defense mechanism on the part of the Reform Jew who by its constant iteration confesses that he cannot meet the problem of the Jew in the modern world. The early leaders of the Reform movement defined this mission as an obligation to stand for all that is ethical and just and pure in modern morals; Dr. Emil G. Hirsch declared that the Jew must remain true to this "mission" idea until such time as the world at large realizes that justice and mercy and the other teachings of the prophets shall control man's actions. Today the student of religion knows that the Jew has no special right to any of these virtues. Even if his own prophets were the first to proclaim them, they have become the common property of all the great religions of the world. All that is left to justify the presence of the Jews as Jews is to live as Jews, to find a place for themselves as Jews in the scheme of the universe and then to fill it worthily. This implies of course that the Jew must make his own direct contribution to life and that it must be different from the contribution of all other religious groups.

Under modern conditions this is no easy task. In the middle ages hatred and fear and jealousy surrounded the Jew. He had no choice but to live the life of his own people. It was a throbbing life, always on the alert, always growing. For in spite of the restrictions of the ghetto it was the Jew who was the "middleman" everywhere. It was he who carried the commerce of one country into the next; he introduced the products of the orient to the occident and the goods of the levant to the west. Nor did he do less for the manners and customs, the art and literature, the professions of the people among whom he traveled. His broad contacts transported civilizations from one soil to another. But all this time his own law of life was the law of Israel. It grew as he grew, but it remained Jewish.

Not until the coming of Reform did Judaism descend to the flat level of modernity. Previous to that time the Jew drew no distinction between life and religion; the latter was constantly adjusting itself to ideas born out of the former. In this regard orthodox Judaism held a distinct advantage over Christianity. It

*"Judaism at Bay," by Horace Kallen. Published by Bloch. $2.50.

was always a thing of this earth. it was natural as opposed to the supernatural tendencies in Christianity. Hence when science began to revolutionize man's ideas of God and the universe, other religions found themselves facing a very serious impasse but Judaism went forward fearlessly, embracing the new doctrines of creation and human growth because it had always been close to life.

Now that Judaism as exemplified in Reform finds itself "at bay," what will the leaders do, asks Dr. Kallen. Their difficulties are many. They have tried several means of ridding themselves of their perplexing problems, but without result. Somehow or other, their own sons, who should be the group out of which continued leadership may come, do not continue the work of the fathers. Too few children of pioneer reform households find their way in the ministry; too few of them remain interested in the synagogues which their elders have set up. Reform Rabbinical leadership still comes from the homes of the orthodox. A fine group of young men are thus started on their way each year; but somehow or other their enthusiasms wane before they are in the pulpit very long; they become commonplace or are silenced.

Dr. Kallen regrets also the weakness of the religious school. Very little profit can come from the meager instruction which children receive there. Yet without Jewish training young folks cannot acquire an interest in Judaism. There is a hopeful note in this situation, however. And, curiously enough, we must thank Reform Judaism for it; since if Reform did nothing else it certainly improved the status of the Jewish woman. Reform gave her an opportunity to come out of the home and assume a share of responsibility in Jewish affairs. The Jewish woman can now show her gratitude to the leadership which "emancipated" her by making herself useful in continuing the thread of Jewish life. This she can best do by teaching her own children while they are still young enough to absorb by example and precept so that when they leave the home they will desire to continue the study and practice of the religion of their parents. Unfortunately few modern Jewish mothers know or study the foundations of their religion; what they themselves do not understand they cannot pass on to their children; thus a great influence is lost.

Then what influence still remains? Dr. Kallen answers—"Zionism." In the final chapter of his book, written in recent months, he speaks of the need for religion in the human heart. This has always been and always will be; and men will find a way to gratify it. Since the thinking Jew knows that what he desires is something more than a building where he can worship occasionally, since what he craves is a living, pulsating Judaism extending further than the reaches of the synagogue, something that will encompass all life "a Hebraism," as Dr. Kallen terms it, he must turn to Zion "as the dynamics and inspiration of his efforts." He must hope for "collective effort and collective self-expression in his ancestral land, a freedom which, for good or for evil, the Jew cannot attain and should not seek in America." In this country the Jew can only "contribute his own past experience to the dominant cultural tradition."

Once the hope for the restoration of Palestine was only compensation for the slings and rebuffs of the world. Today the picture is completely changed. It is now one of salvation; it is the Jew's effort to remake himself in the image of his fathers; it is his chance at "redemption from the vanities of a moral materialism, from the futilities of a life without root or direction." The modern Jew dare not abandon the plan for the restoration of the home-land for it is the last hope between him and extinction. If he cares to live on as a genuine Jew, if he cares to have an object with which to enrich his life as a Jew, then he must be true to this vision of a restored Zion, the all-in-all of his being.

Not everyone will be willing to accept this study of the status of the modern Jew. They who do not, however, will be largely the men and women who have little interest in Judaism. For these large numbers it will not matter whether or not Judaism survives at all. For those who are seriously concerned with its continuance, Dr. Kallen has performed a true service in setting forth the problem as he sees it—and its solution as he would work it out. Until some better way is found the modern Jew remains his debtor.

JENNIE FRANKLIN PURVIN.

Correspondence

Joseph Smith and the Mormons

Editor of UNITY:

I enjoyed May Stranathan's article on Joseph Smith and Plato, but having lately listened to a discussion of the early days of Mormonism, I am inclined to think she gives Smith too much credit for formulating Mormon doctrine.

Mr. Carle Robbins, who has been editor at different times of two Cleveland magazines, has made a study of the pioneer days in his native county of Geauga, lying east of Cleveland, and is satisfied that it offers the real cradle of Mormonism. The book of Mormon, he says, was the work of Sidney Rigdon, an evangelist—one of the pioneers of the Campbellite movement. It was he who planned the new religion and recruited Smith.

Rigdon spent a winter holding Campbellite revival services in various Geauga villages and made many converts. Seemingly he decided that better fruits might be garnered in a vineyard of his own than in the service of the Campbellite sect. Mr. Robbins identifies the house and the period in which he was at work writing the book of Mormon. One thing more was needed—an authentic prophet. In the course of a visit to New York state he found just the man in Joseph Smith, a dreamer of dreams, a well finder and worker of other rural miracles. The discovery of the sacred tablets was staged, after which Rigdon and Smith embarked upon their missionary work, choosing the very field which Rigdon had so effectually planted with the Campbellite seed.

Rigdon was the exhorter—Smith the prophet, the recipient of revelations. Many of his revelations were of a single type. They commanded some prosperous convert to deed all his property to the Lord. In support of one such revelation, he exhibited an actual written message on the bedsheet which had served him on the night of the vision. It commanded a certain farmer to deed his farm to the service of the Almighty. Dramatically exhibited in church, this message of Deity created a great sensation until it was pointed out that he had misspelled the name of the farmer so commanded. Awe turned to anger and the apostles were tarred and feathered and driven from town. This was in Garrettsville, if I remember rightly.

Better success attended their efforts in other parts of the county and there is a flourishing church of the Latter Day Saints at Kirtland, also one in Cleveland which predate the Brigham Young era. These churches repudiate polygamy as a heresy.

In accounting for the religious eccentricities of Western Reserve pioneers, especially the hill folk of the more remote areas, Mr. Robbins has developed the interesting theory that it was due to the badness of their cooking. Hav-

ing sampled the surviving technique in many rural homes, having seen an anxious mother tenderly nurture an ailing child on mince pie, he feels it is not necessary to look further for the source of the visions, revelations, soul-consciousness, doubts, fears and scruples that bred not only the prophets and exhorters, but the awed, the shouting, the writhing converts to their messages.

Certainly pioneer Ohio was a spawning ground of sects, both religious and social. It numbered in its early days some fifty community experiments, varying from the celibate Shakerism of Cuyahoga county, to the free love of Berlin Heights. That Mormonism belongs to the Ohio category, I think anyone would be convinced who listens to Mr. Robbins's evidence.

H. P. BOYNTON.

Cleveland, Ohio.

The Doctors Against War

Editor of UNITY:

The autumn issue of the *War Resister* has an item of utmost importance relating to an influential class of professional men and women—the medicos. It is entitled "League of Doctors Against War" and reads as follows:

> "During the sitting of the Anti-War Congress at Amsterdam at the end of August, an International Medical Conference took place at which representatives from France, England, Germany, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Switzerland, Holland, etc., also from the Far East, were present. The Conference was in agreement with Dr. Felix Boenheim (Berlin), who was appointed Secretary of the League, that the terrible consequences of the last war from the standpoint of the health and life of the nations, demanded concerted action from the medical profession against war. Dr. Bushnell (London) gave statistical evidence of post-war diseases, and stressed the great increase among the new generation born during the war, of *certified mental deficiency*.
>
> "An International Appeal to Doctors against war was unanimously passed, and those present undertook to carry out educational work showing the evils of war and the horrors that would follow the use of poison gas. An International Medical Committee of the Anti-War Congress was set up with headquarters in Berlin (Dr. Felix Boenheim, Berlin, Schluterstrasse 33, Germany) to continue the collection of evidence and direct the doctors' campaign against war. The desire was expressed to have a further conference in London during 1933."

Naturally, every advocate of peace will rejoice at this beginning toward international action on a matter fraught with such immeasurable possibilities of benefit to mankind. May I suggest that each who reads this shall make what effort he can to spread the word of this organization. I think I may justly be called a pioneer in this line of thought as an article by me on "War and the Medical Profession" was published six years ago in UNITY (Chicago). Revised and with some additions it is now being distributed in leaflet form by the Women's Peace Society, 20 Vesey St., N. Y. C. Copies can be obtained free on request from the W. P. S. by sending postage.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Brookline, Mass.

From a Firm Friend

Editor of UNITY:

Another cycle is complete and the renewed opportunity to take a hand in the support of your ever welcomed weekly visit is here. We wonder how deeply the depression has cut into your income and wish it would allow us to share more largely in material backing.

DOREMUS SCUDDER.

Claremont, California.

Equal Privileges for All

Editor of UNITY:

The limiting of the ballot by a number of our states to the two major parties is an abridgment of individual liberty in the exercise of voting privileges. Under such a system, the presidential elections are not a true indication of public sentiment. Candidates who might have polled a heavy vote in the states excluding them from the ballot are unjustly deprived of their vote in the said states through restrictive laws. Hence, the election results cannot be considered fully representative of popular will throughout the country. In order to assure all candidates the equal opportunities and privileges that our charter of liberties guarantees, this crying abuse in our ballot system should be silenced. There is no redress except through remedial legislation by the states that impose these restrictive laws so out of tune with the cardinal principles of democracy. It is for the coming legislatures of the respective states to remedy this un-American situation and to accord *equal* rights and privileges to *all* parties.

ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY.

Lakeland, Florida.

World Disarmament Depends on India

Editor of UNITY:

All the world is thinking about disarmament; but how little does it understand what is primarily in the way? The absolutely indispensable condition of international disarmament is that Great Britain shall first give freedom to India. The reason why is clear as the sun. The other nations of the world will not disarm so long as Great Britain remains armed. Everybody admits that. But Great Britain must remain armed, simply can not disarm, so long as she holds India in her possession by force. Every Englishman knows that without a strong army and navy England would lose her great Indian Empire in a day. It follows that the first step towards world disarmament absolutely must be the freeing of India. Then (but not before) Britain can disarm and thus make it possible for other nations to do the same. Thus we see that so long as India's bondage continues, all talk at Geneva or anywhere else, about general international disarmament, is and must continue to be, mere camouflage, mere make believe, mere words without any real meaning, mere whistling to the wind.

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Encouragement

Editor of UNITY:

Sirs—Enclosed find check $3.00 for renewal of Christmas subscription that goes to ————.

I am glad to keep UNITY going to all familiar places and am sorry to see that any one who has been on the list cannot still enjoy the richness of your wonderful publication.

The article in December 19 issue by Amos Pinchot is well worth the price of a dozen subscriptions.

ISAAC F. BAKER.

El Monte, Calif.

In the Same Boat

Dear UNITY:

How dreadful, those letters from people who can no longer pay your fare to their homes! Each letter fell like a blow on a tender spot, for I am in the "same boat" myself. But somehow, I feel that I shall find a way to keep you coming—I am "doing without" many things—but, to be forced to do without you would indeed be "the last straw." So, even if it should so happen, that I do not send in my subscription exactly on time, don't give me up!

L. N. S.

New York.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 258)

course, be freed from the system by which Indian prosperity is sacrificed to the interests of foreign capitalists. But Gandhi has said very plainly that when the Congress has power, all will have to put their wealth at the service of the starving millions of India and that all titles to property will be subject to investigation. He said at the Round Table Conference that "for years India would be engaged in passing legislation in order to raise the downtrodden from the mire into which they had been sunk by capitalists, by the landlords, by the so-called higher classes, and then subsequently and scientifically, by the British rulers. "If the landlords, zamindars, moneyed men, and those who are today enjoying privileges—I do not care whether they are Europeans or Indians—if they find that they are discriminated against I shall sympathize with them but I will not be able to help them." The

downtrodden would have to be given grants freely, said Mr. Gandhi, and those grants would come from the moneyed classes, including the Europeans.

And, even if it were true that the wealthy classes would gain financially by India's freedom, they would certainly stand to lose financially by supporting the Congress. They run the danger of having their property confiscated if it is known that they support the Congress, which is an illegal body and many of them have lost their property in this way. Some, like Jamnalal Bajaj, treasurer to the Congress, who has given up his millions and is living like a poor man, have sacrificed their all and live the lives of the exploited whose battle they are fighting.

Secondly, even if some wealthy people are moved by economic motives to support the Congress, is this any reason for the Congress to refuse such support? The Congress would be weakening the struggle against British Imperialism if it did not unite all the forces which can be used against British rule. It would be a different matter if those who merely give financial help were given power and were allowed to control the policy of the Congress. But, as Gandhi has repeatedly emphasized, the influence of the Indian commercial classes on the policy of the Congress is nil. Gandhi said that if the Congress wanted to declare a boycott of Indian mills today, it could do so.

Although the Indian mill owners gain an advantage from the existing boycott on British goods, this is merely incidental. The Congress policy, far from being in the interests of the Indian wealthy classes, is a policy in the interests of the "starving millions" of workers and peasants of India. We remind our readers of some of the resolutions adopted by the Congress at Karachi. These included a living wage and limited hours of labor for industrial workers and the protection of women workers, the prohibition against employment of children of school-going age in factories, and also the right of labor to form unions. Other resolutions provided for the reduction of land revenues and agricultural rents, and the imposition of progressive income tax on all incomes above a fixed income and a graduated inheritance tax.

In addition Gandhi has said that he does not intend "to substitute a brown bureaucracy for a white bureaucracy"; but wants to see a Government of peasants which would provide them with bread and butter.

We are aware that the objection may be made by some people that the Karachi resolutions and statements made by Gandhi are merely dust thrown in the eyes of the Indian peasants and workers to blind them to the real nature of Gandhi and the Congress. But surely this can only be maintained by those who are blind to facts. Those who know the personal life of Gandhi, who know how he has given up wealth and luxury to serve the cause of the Indian masses, who know that even in prison he refused the allowance made by the Government for food and lived on a few pence a day, because as he said, this allowance comes out of the revenue paid by the poor, must realize that the movement which he leads is no sham, and no pretense, but is a movement which is fighting the battle of the Indian masses against the most ruthless oppression.

The leaders of the Indian Congress have sacrificed their all in the cause of India's freedom. They have taken the path which leads to poverty, imprisonment and perhaps even greater suffering. To regard such fighters for freedom as Gandhi, Nehru, Bajaj, and other Congress leaders as agents of the Indian bourgeoisie because they have sprung from wealthy middle class families, has as much meaning as to call Karl Marx and Lenin petit-bourgeois because they sprung from middle-class families.

Let us look facts in the face. One fact which stands out today is that the capitalists have succeeded in deluding all classes in Britain into the belief that Gandhi and the Congress are tools of the Indian capitalists. This is a masterpiece of tactics. Although the reasons why different sections of the English people hold this view vary, none the less, it means a united front of practically all classes in Britain against Gandhi and the Congress.

A united front against Gandhi and the Congress means a united front for British Imperialism and against the Indian workers and peasants.

India Bulletin (London, England)

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

Subscribe to

The New Humanist

A Bi-Monthly Journal for Thoughtful and Selective Readers

A critical and creative journal with man-centered interests. It neither duplicates nor competes. Concise in form it appeals particularly to those seeking substantial material in new fields. Our friends are our best copy-writers:

Harry Elmer Barnes says:

"The New Humanist is the journal of the vanguard in religious progress today. Its contributors are distinguished scholars and thinkers and the subjects covered are both urgent and diversified."

And John Dewey:

"There is valuable material in this journal which I do not find elsewhere. I am confident that there is a particular audience waiting for the ideas which are set forth in it."

As well as others:

"Dignified, scientific, stimulating and suggestive—"A. Eustace Haydon. "A refreshing oasis in the desert of compromise and dishonest thought," Rabbi Solomon Goldman. "Fulfills an altogether unique function in contemporary American life," Maynard Shipley.

Per copy 20c, *Annually* $1.00

THE NEW HUMANIST

105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

An Outstanding Collection!

SOCIAL HYMNS

Prepared under the direction of The Survey Associates

This hymnal has had more influence on present day hymnology than any other single source. It contains 110 Hymns of Brotherhood, Peace and Social Awakening. *With Music.*

Price—*Cloth*, 50 cents, *Paper*, 25 cents

A. S. Barnes and Company

(*Hymn Book Publishers Since 1858*)

67 West 44th St. New York

La Follette's

Great National Weekly Newspaper

THE PROGRESSIVE

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER

4 Months

— 21 — ISSUES

50c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 50 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.

The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.